DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 866 SP 013 286

AUTHOR Morris, John E.; Chissom, Brad S.
TITLE Student Teaching Concerns Before and After Student Teaching.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, Louisiana, November 8-10, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Anxiety; Class Management; Classroom Environment; Parent Attitudes; *Performance Factors; *Student Teachers; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Assignment; Time Blocks

ABSTRACT

This study had three purposes: to compare the concerns of student teachers in a full semester program with the concerns of those in an eight-week, block program; to apply a factor analytic approach to the classification of student teacher concerns; and to determine the level and direction of changes in concerns as a result of experiences during student teaching. Student teachers were administered a 69-item instrument with items scored on a Likert-type scale administered at the beginning (pretest) and end (posttest) of the semester. The following six areas of concern for student teachers were examined: (1) relationships with supervisory personnel; (2) conditions in the student teaching setting; (3) student achievement; (4) assignment to student teaching; (5) time; and (6) adequacy of preparation and classroom management. Analysis of results indicated changes in the concerns and attitudes of student teachers over the course of the teaching experience. Most notable was the lessening of concern about relationships with supervisors and more concern about the academic achievement of their students. (Authors/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161866

STUDENT TEACHING CONCERNS

BEFORE AND AFTER STUDENT TEACHING

John E. Morris
Texas A & M University

and

Brad S. Chissom
University of Alabama

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brad S. Chissom

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, November 8-10, 1978.

SP013 286

ABSTRACT

This study had three purposes: (1) compare the concerns of student teachers in a full semester program with the concerns of those in an eight week, block-program; (2) apply a factor analytic approach to the classification of student teacher concerns; and (3) determine the level and direction of changes in concerns as a result of experiences during student teaching.

Concerns of student teachers have been researched to a considerable extent in the past. This study was different from most of those efforts in that items of concern were grouped using a factor analytic approach instead of a rational approach. Further comparisons were made among types of student teacher programs and groups of student teachers participating in these programs. Results are of significance to individuals who are responsible for training teachers for the public school systems in relation to the concerns expressed by beginning student teachers and how these concerns change as a result of practical experience.

All the student teachers (N=238) enrolled for the Spring, 1978, semester at Texas A & M University were administered a 69 item instrument with items scored on a Likert-type scale. The scale was administered at the beginning (pretest) and end (posttest) of the semester. Six groups of student teachers who participated were: (1) elementary with kindergarten endorsement; (2) elementary only; (3) secondary education; (4) non-education secondary majors; (5) health and physical educations; and (6) agricultural education.

The total score on the instrument was used to compare mean differences among the six groups, and a significant F was obtained. Pair-wise comparisons were made which showed the health and physical education and agricultural education groups to be significantly different from the other four groups. These two groups had participated in an eight week, block-program while the other four groups participated in a full semester of student teaching.

A principal components analysis with a varimax rotation on the posttest scores yielded a factor structure with six interpretable factors. Subjects from the first four groups were used and the other two groups were eliminated due to the lack of homogeneity among subjects. The six factors were: (1) concerns about relationships with supervisory personnel; (2) concerns about conditions in the student teaching setting; (3) concerns about student achievement; (4) concerns about assignment to student teaching; (5) concerns about time; and (6) concerns about adequacy of preparation and classroom management. Changes in concerns from present to posttest were negative (less concern) when they involved working with supervisors and positive (more concern) when they related to student achievement.

STUDENT TEACHING CONCERNS

BEFORE AND AFTER STUDENT TEACHING

It is a generally accepted fact that student teachers face a wide variety of problems which limit their effectiveness in the classroom. The concerns and anxieties of student teachers and the effects of these concerns on performance are consistently substantiated by the literature associated with student teaching and those individuals who work closely with student teachers. A primary task of the coordinators of student teaching, university supervisors, and supervising teachers is the identification of these concerns and development of methods to help each student teacher successfully deal with them.

Concerns of student teachers has been an area of considerable research effort during the fifties and sixties (1, 2, 3, 4). Investigators have used various types of rating scales, open-ended questions, problem check lists, recordings, group discussions, and interviews as measures of student teacher concerns. Though there was a high degree of consistency among the findings, even when studies used a variety of data collection instruments and populations (5), responses of subjects were restricted to selected stimuli. It can be assumed from examining these stimuli that an important part of each study related to situational or programmatical concerns and that these concerns are not generalizable beyond the specific student teaching situation. Since the success of a student teacher is largely dependent upon specific program procedures,

requirements, support, and teaching situations, concerns will vary and the identification of these situational concerns is important. Researchers have not attempted to determine effects of such variables as subject area, length of the student teaching experience, and teaching level upon the kind and intensity of student teacher concerns. Several studies support the proposition that situation-specific concerns, i.e., the concerns of a person in a specific situation, may provide a more accurate index of student teacher concerns than a general measure (6, 7, 8). Also, an alternative to the intuitive classification of concerns is badly needed (9).

Purposes of study

Beginning with the 1977-78 academic year, the Department of Educational Curriculum and Instruction at Texas A & M University implemented a full semester student teaching program. Under the full semester program, student teachers were required to devote full-time to student teaching, were not permitted to take other courses, and, in many cases, had to severely curtail the amount of time spent in employment and other types of activities. Prior to the 1977-78 academic year, an eight week, block-type program existed. The coordinator of field experiences and the supervisory staff felt that this change in the program might create concerns among student teachers which would be detrimental to their progress and to the success of the new program. Two departments at Texas A & M University, Health and Physical Education and Agricultural Education, continued an eight week, block-type program.

The purposes of this study were to:

1. Compare the concerns of student teachers in a full semester program with those in an eight week block-type program.
2. Apply a factor analytic approach, as suggested by Cohen (9), to the classification of student teacher concerns as an alternative to the intuitive sorting of concerns into categories.
3. Identify the concerns of student teachers in a full semester program of student teaching.
4. Determine if the level and direction of concerns changed as a result of experiences during student teaching.

PROCEDURES

Subjects

The subjects in this study were all elementary and secondary student teachers enrolled at Texas A & M University during the Spring Semester, 1978. All subjects were classified as seniors and for most, student teaching was the final course work required for graduation. Characteristics of the subjects are presented in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Elementary majors with a kindergarten endorsement spent seven weeks in a kindergarten assignment and eight weeks in an elementary assignment. Elementary, secondary EDCI (Educational

Curriculum and Instruction) and non-EDCI (students who were majoring in various academic departments and seeking certification through EDCI by completing nine semester hours in professional education and student teaching) majors spent the entire semester in student teaching. Subjects in health and physical education and agricultural education spent the first 6 weeks in block-type courses on campus and the remaining 8 weeks in student teaching.

Instrument Construction

The instrument used in this study was designed to identify concerns of student teachers about specific aspects of the student teaching programs at Texas A & M University and the schools in which students were placed for student teaching. Of special interest was the effect of time spent in student teaching on concerns of subjects, since this was the first year of a full semester of student teaching for elementary and secondary EDCI and non-EDCI students. Ideas for items were drawn from characteristics and requirements of the preparation and student teaching programs in the various departments, discussions with students in orientation to student teaching sessions, supervising teachers, university supervisors, and cooperating principals. Sixty-nine items were selected by the university supervisors to compose a Student Teacher Concerns Checklist. The items were arranged in a random order for the final form and are shown in Table 2.

Data Collection

The Checklist was administered to subjects in an orientation session just prior to the beginning of student teaching and during the final seminar at the completion of student teaching. Instructions and purposes of the study were presented prior to distributing the Checklist and subjects were assured of the anonymity of their responses. The term "concerns" was defined and examples given. Oral and written instructions specified that each item was to be answered by selecting the most appropriate of the five response alternatives. The alternatives and their point value are as follows: not concerned (1); a little concerned (2); moderately concerned (3); very concerned (4); and extremely concerned (5).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reliability estimates (Cronbach Alphas) for the Checklist were .97 for both pre- and post-test. An analysis of variance to test for mean differences among the six groups using total scores on the 69 items pre- and post-test yielded a significant F value ($F>13.22$, df 5 & 244, $p<.0001$). Application of Scheffe's Test to pairs of means showed that groups 5 (health and physical education) and 6 (agricultural education) were significantly different from groups 1-4. Since groups 5 and 6 were significantly different from groups 1-4 and group 6 was significantly different from group 5, proper treatment of these differences would have made this paper too long and unwieldly. The authors decided to eliminate groups 5 and 6 from this study. Further

study of these results is continuing and it is hoped that they may be reported at a later date.

A principal components analysis with varimax rotation using responses of groups 1-4 on the post-test yielded six significant factors. These six factors were interpretable and well-balanced according to the number of items with significant loadings (significant loading$\geq$.40). The six factors accounted for 52 percent of the common variance.

A principal components analysis of the pre-test items provided a factor structure that was difficult to interpret. More than one-third (24) of the items loaded significantly ($\geq$.40) on a first factor and little differentiation could be made among the remaining factors. The differences between the principal components analyses of the pre- and post-test data may be due to the lack of teaching experience by student teachers resulting in their inability to respond differentially to the pre-test items. The more interpretable factor structure on the post-test may be attributed to the ability of the subjects to respond differentially, once they had completed student teaching.

The principal components analysis based on post-test data produced a grouping for the items. After careful examination of the items comprising the factors, the factors were named as follows:

Factor I: Relationships with supervisory personnel, teachers and students

Factor II: Conditions in the student teaching setting

Factor III: Student achievement

Factor IV: Assignment to student teaching

Factor V: Time

Factor VI: Adequacy of preparation and classroom management

The factor structure, pre- and post-test means, directional shift of concerns from pre- to post-test, and significant differences or item means from pre- to post-test are shown in Table 2. For each of the 69 items a significant difference was determined as at least one-half of a scale point between

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

pre- and post-test means. This difference was significant beyond the .01 level and considered to be a conservative estimate of change. The authors felt that without the use of this conservative estimate, the large N tended to make even small changes from pre- to post-test statistically significant and misleading.

Factor I focuses on relationships between the student teacher and significant others--university supervisor, supervising teacher, principal, teachers and students. Six items changed significantly in a negative direction and one (item 1) in a positive direction. The significant change for item one identifies a concern which is widespread in schools. This was the only item in Factor I which changed in a positive direction. The six items which changed significantly in a

negative direction clearly indicate that effective, positive relationships with significant others were established. Lock (10) found that about one-fourth of the student teachers studied indicated difficulties in establishing positive relationships with their supervising teachers. Changes in a negative direction on all items, except number one, is what was expected if the student teaching program was effective.

Factor II, concerns about conditions in the student teaching setting, indicates that student teachers are more concerned about the attitudes of parents toward them at the end of student teaching than in the beginning. Concerns about limitations placed on the academic freedom of teachers and student use and abuse of drugs changed significantly in a negative direction. The decrease in the level of concerns on the drug issue was probably a result of media coverage of selected incidents which were not applicable to conditions in the student teaching settings. The negative direction of change on all items, except 17 and 19, indicates that the student teaching setting provided satisfactory conditions for achieving the basic objectives of the student teaching program.

Factor III, concerns about student achievement, was the strongest of the factors in that it accounted for a larger percent of the common variance and a larger proportion of items. Although there were no items on which changes from pre- to post-test were significant, the increase in the level of concerns on 13 of the 18 items indicates that student teachers were

increasingly concerned about student progress. These findings seem to contradict those of Iannaccone and Button (11) who reported that the concern for the learning of pupils was replaced with concern for getting through the class. However, the findings are supported by Anderson (12) who found that the ability to effect student learning was the area of greatest concern to student teachers.

Factor IV, concerns about assignment to student teaching, relates to the procedures used in making assignments, requirements for admission to and completion of student teaching, and living and travel arrangements during student teaching. Significant changes in a negative direction occurred on three items. Student teachers were able to find acceptable living arrangements and to effectively solve transporation problems. The significant change in a negative direction on item 47, again indicates the success experienced by student teachers in establishing positive relationships with their supervising teachers. The level of concern about the place (item 50) students were assigned to student teach is especially important. This significant decrease in concern over "place" indicates that student teachers were more concerned about the kinds and quality of experiences than the places to which they are assigned.

Factor V, concerns about time, was an especially important part of this study since the amount of time spent in student teaching had been increased from eight to sixteen weeks. This increase in time also resulted in an increase in the number and

variety of requirements for successful completion of student teaching. Although none of the changes were significant, the negative direction of change indicated that student teachers felt that the additional time and requirements were not cause for concern.

Factor VI, concerns about adequacy of preparation and classroom management, only one item (65) changed significantly. Student teachers found that they were able to handle the extra duties that teachers are normally expected to perform. The direction of change on other items in this factor was mixed. Responses to the item dealing specifically with classroom management (60) changed in a negative direction indicating a lessening of concern about classroom management, while responses on a clearly related item (61) showed an increasing concern about students who disrupt classes. Perhaps student teachers did not perceive strategies necessary to deal with disruptive students as part of classroom management.

When the overall changes in the level and direction of concerns are considered, it is evident that a shift occurred from concerns which affected student teachers themselves to concerns which affected their students. Similar shifts in the level and focus of concerns have been reported by Fuller (5) and Lock (10). These changes seem to support the positive aspects of student teaching and contradict the conclusions of Wilbur and Gooding (13) and MacDonald and Zaret (14) who question the value of student teaching on the grounds that

anxiety levels and attitudes are more negative at the end of student teaching.

Summary

The data presented in this study have several important implications for future research and for those who are responsible for and work in student teaching programs. First, a factor analytic approach to the classification of concerns is an effective approach. It avoids the bias and inconsistency which is always present, to a degree, when using judges for sorting and categorizing items. The post-test provided the best data for the principal component analysis, seemingly because the student teaching experience enabled subjects to better differentiate among concerns. Without these experiences, responses resulted in a factor structure which was uninterpretable. If more than one group of student teachers is included, procedures should be used to determine if the groups are homogeneous and groups which differ significantly should be eliminated before attempting a factor analytic procedure.

Second, concerns among students are situational in that different types of preparation and student teaching programs, the concerns stimuli presented to student teachers on the data collection instrument, and student teaching settings, differ significantly. Thus, it is not possible to speak of concerns of student teachers in a generic sense. Although, as Cohen (9) suggests, there is some commonality of concerns, each program should include provisions for identifying concerns specific

to that program. On the basis of this study, it is not possible to tell whether the differences in concerns between groups 1-4 and 5 & 6 were a result of the time spent in student teaching, conditions and relationships in the student teaching setting, or the preparation program. In all likelihood, all of these variables contributed to the differences and further study is needed in this area.

Third, the level and direction of student teacher concerns does change during the student teaching experience. The level of concerns about establishing and maintaining professional relationships with university supervisors, supervising teachers, principals, and students decreases, indicating that positive, helpful relationships have been achieved. Concerns about student achievement seemed to increase during student teaching, indicating professional growth and maturity.

Finally, this and other studies can provide background for increased effort to help student teachers recognize and deal with their concerns. If those who are responsible for student teaching programs will take the initiative, more student teachers will have greater success in this crucial stage of becoming a competent, beginning professional.

TABLE 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS

Groups	Pretest Sex M	Pretest Sex F	Pretest No. of Ss	Posttest Sex M	Posttest Sex F	Posttest No. of Ss
1. Elementary with kindergarten endorsement	-	44	44	-	33	33
2. Elementary majors	1	48	49	2	44	46
3. Secondary EDCI majors	3	26	29	17	23	40
4. Secondary non-EDCI majors	8	17	25	8	16	24
5. Health and physical education majors	24	30	54	24	27	51
6. Agricultural education majors	32	5	37	28	5	33
TOTALS	68	170	238	79	148	227

TABLE 2

FACTOR STRUCTURE, PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST MEANS AND

DIRECTION OF CHANGE IN MEAN SCORE

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
FACTOR I: Concerns about relationships with supervisory personnel, teachers and students					
1. Lack of respect of some students for me.	.52	.39	1.86	2.76	+*
2. Standards, requirements, and regulations of my supervising teacher.	.67	.54	3.59	3.00	-*
3. Standards, requirements, and regulations of my university supervisor.	.69	.61	3.56	3.25	-
4. My knowledge of the content (subject matter) in my student teaching assignment.	.57	.45	3.36	2.95	-
5. My relationship with my supervising teacher.	.61	.69	3.80	3.21	-*
6. My relationship with my university supervisor.	.64	.73	3.58	3.12	-
7. My relationship with the principal.	.69	.53	3.52	2.80	-*
8. Whether the students really (will) (did) like me.	.54	.41	3.22	2.89	-
9. About how other teachers in the school (will accept) (did accept) me.	.59	.55	2.86	2.49	-
10. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control.	.47	.56	3.89	3.55	-
11. Doing well when my supervising teacher (is) (was) observing my teaching.	.64	.67	3.96	3.34	-*

TABLE 2

(continued)

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
12. Doing well when my university observes (ed) my teaching.	.59	.60	4.07	3.61	-
13. Doing well when the principal observes (ed) my teaching.	.49	.44	4.00	3.16	-*
14. Getting a fair evaluation of my performance during student teaching.	.45	.52	3.57	3.19	-
15. Feeling at ease with my university supervisor.	.45	.54	3.69	2.76	-*
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor I = .13					
FACTOR II: Concerns about conditions in the student teaching setting					
16. Meeting expenses during student teaching.	.57	.40	2.97	2.94	-
17. What parents of the students (will think) (thought) about their child being taught by a student teacher.	.59	.51	2.34	2.84	+*
18. (Being able to) (Maintaining) a part-time job.	.50	.48	1.88	1.71	-
19. Remarks teachers (will make) (made) about students.	.49	.42	2.80	2.94	+
20. Working with too many students each day.	.48	.49	2.54	2.48	-
21. Too many non-instructional duties.	.62	.45	2.38	2.30	-
22. Lack of academic freedom (being able to teach what I thought was important).	.50	.42	3.04	2.42	-*

TABLE 2

(continued)

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
23. Student use and abuse of drugs.	.44	.32	2.86	2.35	-*
24. The wide diversity of student ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds.	.59	.45	2.63	2.58	-
25. The griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among the teachers.	.46	.43	2.52	2.25	-
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor II = .08					
FACTOR III: Concerns about student achievement					
26. Whether students are (did) learn(ing) what they should.	.59	.58	3.99	4.11	+
27. The nature and quality of instructional materials.	.43	.46	3.25	3.52	+
28. Maintaining student interest in the subject and class activities.	.55	.59	4.03	3.78	-
29. Meeting the wide range of student needs.	.63	.62	3.89	3.94	+
30. Being fair and impartial to my students.	.64	.61	3.41	3.55	+
31. Diagnosing student learning problems.	.58	.57	3.38	3.53	+
32. Being able to help students remediate problems once the problems (have been) (were) identified.	.65	.62	3.34	3.52	+
33. Handling controversial issues in the classroom.	.43	.44	3.15	3.06	-
34. Challenging the unmotivated students.	.73	.67	3.67	3.84	+

TABLE 2

(continued)

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
35. Whether students can apply what they learn.	174	.66	3.46	3.61	+
36. Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals.	.83	.75	3.66	3.85	+
37. Insuring that students (are) (were) able to perform basic skills.	.79	.74	3.61	3.86	+
38. The psychological climate of the school.	.42	.45	3.17	3.04	-
39. Assessing and reporting student progress.	.54	.56	3.01	2.99	-
40. The social and emotional problems of students.	.62	.55	3.22	3.48	+
41. Lack of progress of certain students.	.68	.68	3.39	3.77	+
42. Adequately presenting all the required material.	.51	.54	3.42	3.33	-
43. The attitudes and values of students.	.58	.49	3.17	3.62	+
44. Being accepted and respected as a professional person.	.42	.46	3.47	3.00	-
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor III = .14					
FACTOR IV: Concerns about assignment to student teaching					
45. Being able to find or continue in appropriate living accomodations.	.46	.44	2.48	1.81	-*
46. Arranging transportation to my student teaching assignment.	.57	.45	2.38	1.96	-
47. Feeling at ease with my supervising teacher.	.46	.56	3.76	2.79	-*
48. Being isolated from Campus life.	.47	.44	2.56	2.68	+

TABLE 2

(continued)

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
49. The kind of information provided about student teaching before assignments were made.	.47	.48	2.93	3.08	+
50. The place where I (will be) (was) assigned for student teaching.	.47	.63	3.78	2.62	-*
51. The way in which assignments to student teaching were made.	.70	.55	2.89	2.45	-
52. The requirements (criteria) for admission to student teaching.	.61	.55	2.50	2.15	-
53. The requirements for successful completion of student teaching.	.61	.55	3.31	2.92	-
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor IV = .07					
FACTOR V: Concerns about time					
54. Feeling under pressure too much of the time.	.56	.48	3.18	2.99	-
55. The routine and inflexibility of the situation.	.46	.39	2.74	2.62	-
56. Finding enough time for social activities.	.59	.53	2.23	2.32	+
57. The amount of time required for student teaching.	.65	.55	3.44	3.25	-
58. The amount of time necessary for preparation for teaching.	.67	.62	3.57	3.36	-
59. Time to adequately prepare for teaching.	.52	.57	3.65	3.29	-
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor V = .06					

TABLE 2

(continued)

Factor and Item	Factor Loading	Comm. Est.	$\bar{X}$ Pre (N=147)	$\bar{X}$ Post (N=143)	Direction of change
FACTOR VI: Concerns about adequacy of preparation and classroom management					
60. Being able to maintain effective classroom management (discipline).	.51	.69	4.11	3.85	-
61. Students who disrupt classes.	.49	.61	3.59	3.77	+
62. The way(s) in which students (are) (were) grouped for instruction.	.45	.40	2.91	3.00	+
63. The adequacy of what I learned from my professional preparation (education courses to include methods courses).	.61	.53	3.84	3.35	-
64. The adequacy of content (specialization) courses to prepare me to teach.	.61	.55	3.61	3.13	-
65. My (preparation for) (ability to handle) extra duty assignments.	.50	.51	2.90	2.30	-*
Percent of common variance accounted for by Factor VI = .07					
The following items did not load significantly on any factor					
66. The mandated curriculum which (is not) (was not) appropriate for all students.	.36	.25	2.85	2.96	+
67. (Becoming) (Being) too personally involved with students.	.38	.22	2.52	2.36	-
68. Determining the limits of my authority and responsibility.	.37	.46	3.44	3.39	-
69. The possibility of getting a teaching position.	.23	.16	3.78	3.65	-

*Significant beyond .01

REFERENCES

1 R. M. Travers, W. Rabinowitz, and E. Nemovicher, "The Anxieties of a Group of Student Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision 38 (1952): 368-375.

2 M. L. Thompson, "Identifying Anxieties Experienced by Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education 14 (1963): 435-439.

3 D. W. Triplett, "Student Teachers Rank Their Needs," Michigan Educational Journal 45 (1967): 13-14.

4 G. Sorenson and R. Halpert, "Stress in Student Teaching," California Journal of Educational Research 19 (1968): 28-33.

5 F. Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," American Educational Research Journal 6 (1969): 207-226.

6 P. McReynolds, "The Assessment of Anxiety: A Survey of Available Techniques," in Paul McReynolds, ed., Advances in Psychological Assessment (Pala Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books Inc. 1968), Vol. 1, 224-264.

7 R. Alpert and R. Habes, "Anxiety in Academic Achievement Situations," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 61 (1960): 207-215.

8 G. Mandler and H. Cowen, "Test Anxiety Questionnaires," Journal of Counseling Psychology 22 (1958): 228-229.

9 M. W. Cohen, H. L. Mirles, and A. I. Schwebel, "Dimensions of Elementary School Student Teacher Concerns," Journal of Experimental Education 41 (1972): 6-10.

10 C. R. Lock, "Problems of Secondary School Student Teachers," The Teacher Educator 13 (1977): 30-40.

11 L. Iarroccone and W. W. Button, "Functions of Student Teaching, Attitude Formation, and Initiation in Elementary Student Teachers," Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. July 1964, ERIC No. ED003011.

12 H. S. Anderson, "Prospective Teachers have Fears," Clearinghouse 34 (1960): 337-341.

13 P. H. Wilbur and C. T. Gooding, "Attitude Changes in Student Teaching as a Function of Type of Student Teaching Experience," Paper Presented at American Educational Research Association Convention, 1973. ERIC NO. 083132.

14 J. B. MacDonald and E. Zaret, "Student Teaching: Benefit or Burden," Journal of Teacher Education 22 (1971): 51-58.